

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, and 26 are currently pending
- Claims 1, 14, 20, and 22 are amended herein

**[0003]** Support for the amendments to the claims is found in the specification at least in paragraph 39, in Table 1 on page 11, and in claim 20.

### **Cited Documents**

**[0004]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- **Carlucci:** Carlucci et al, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0015999
- **MacInnis:** MacInnis, Alexander G., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0028899
- **Eyal:** Eyal, Aviv, U.S. Patent No. 6,484,199

### **Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, and 26 Are Non-Obvious Over Carlucci in view of MacInnis in further view of Eyal**

**[0005]** Claims 1-3, 14, 15, 19, 20, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Carlucci in view of MacInnis in further view of Eyal. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

**[0006]** Applicant submits that the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

receiving, by head-end equipment from a content provider, a digital television (DTV) application and its associated metadata, wherein the ***receiving is facilitated by an extended asset definition interface, the extended asset definition interface specifying a data structure including the DTV application and metadata attributes consisting of:***

an application identifier field for identifying the DTV application;

an originator identifier field for identifying an originator of the DTV application;

***an application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application and specifying a runtime environment needed to run the DTV application;***

a profile field for indicating a minimum profile of a system on which the DTV application will execute;

a visibility field for indicating the degree of control a user has over the DTV application;

a permission field for denoting “sandbox” security permission of the DTV application; and

a rating field for indicating a rating of the DTV application;

***generating, by the head-end equipment, an application information table*** for conveying application signaling information to a DTV receiving unit, the application information table being generated based on the associated metadata;

generating, by the head-end equipment, a content referencing identifier for the DTV application;

registering, by the head-end equipment, an authority record with an authority to enable the DTV receiving unit to resolve the content referencing identifier;

generating, by the head-end equipment, a data grouping having the application information table and the content referencing identifier;

sending, by the head-end equipment, a transmission to the DTV receiving unit, wherein such transmission comprises the data grouping, whereby the application signaling information is used by the DTV receiving unit to discover and launch the DTV application,

wherein the head-end equipment, the content provider, and the DTV receiving unit are each separate and distinct from each other, and

***wherein the extended asset definition interface is defined to correspond to information that an application signaling generator of the head-end equipment needs to generate the application information table***

**[0007]** In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner cites the receiver 78 in Fig. 5a of Carlucci as describing the extended asset definition interface recited by claim 1. That receiver is further discussed in paragraph 87 of Carlucci as being one or more satellite dishes and as coupling received signal streams to a head-end processor. No mention is made, however, of the receiver 78 “specifying a data structure.” Because claim 1 requires the extended asset definition interface to specify a data structure, the receiver 78 of Carlucci cannot possibly teach or suggest the extended asset definition interface.

**[0008]** The Examiner then proceeds in the rejection to cite various portions of Carlucci as disclosing the fields of the data structure specified by the extended asset definition interface, such as the application identifier field, etc. The portions cited as disclosing these fields, such as paragraph 56 of Carlucci, describe data included in the transmitted content stream received by the head-end of Carlucci, however. They do not

describe fields of a data structure specified by an extended asset definition interface. Carlucci simply does not describe any such extended asset definition interface or data structure specified by that interface.

**[0009]** Also in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner points to the PIC of paragraph 56 of Carlucci as describing the “application-type field for indicating a type of the DTV application.” The PIC is described as identifying a program or program segment. No mention, however, is made of the PIC or anything else which identifies a *type* of the DTV application.

**[0010]** Further in rejecting claim 1, the Examiner points to paragraphs 55, 60, 62, 70, and 74 as disclosing “generating, by the head-end equipment, an application information table for conveying application signaling information to a DTV receiving unit.” Of these paragraphs, the only one to mention a table is paragraph 74. The table mentioned in paragraph 74, however, is a table included in a segmentation message that is received by the head-end. And because the head-end receives the table, it does not generate the table, as recited by claim 1, and in fact teaches away from doing so.

**[0011]** Additionally, Applicant has amended claim 1 to further recite that the extended asset definition interface “is defined to correspond to information that an application signaling generator of the head-end equipment needs to generate the application information table.” Despite the previous inclusion of similar recitations in claim 20, the Examiner has not cited any portion of any of the references as teaching or suggesting such recitations. Applicant has diligently searched the references and can find no teaching or suggestion of these recitations. Accordingly, at least by virtue of their addition, the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

**[0012]** Also, Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite that the “application-type field” specifies “a runtime environment needed to run the DTV application”. This feature has not been previously recited in the claims, and therefore has not been rejected by the Examiner. Applicant has diligently searched the references and can find no teaching or suggestion of these recitations. Accordingly, at least by virtue of their addition, the rejection of claim 1 is overcome.

**[0013]** Consequently, the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

#### *Independent Claims 14, 20, and 22*

**[0014]** Claims 14, 20, and 22 include recitations similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, for at least reasons similar to those given above with reference to claim 1, claims 14, 20, and 22 are also patentable over the cited references.

#### *Dependent Claims 2, 3, 15, 19, and 26*

**[0015]** Claims 2, 3, 15, 19, and 26 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 14, and 22. As discussed above, claims 1, 14, and 22 are patentable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2, 3, 15, 19, and 26 are also patentable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

## **Conclusion**

**[0016]** If any issues remain that would prevent allowance of this application,  
**Applicant requests that the Examiner contact the undersigned representative**  
**before issuing a subsequent Action.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/

Dated: 02/12/2010

Robert C. Peck  
(robp@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826

Kayla Brant  
(kayla@leehayes.com; 509-944-4742)  
Registration No. 46576